

REMARKS

Prior to this amendment, Claims 1, 4-25 and 31-34 were pending in the application. By this amendment, Claims 1, 9, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are amended, and Claims 31-34 are canceled. Claim 35 is added. Hence, Claims 1, 4-25 and 35 are pending in the application.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-25 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Besaw et al.* (“*Besaw ‘789*”; U.S. Pat. No. 5,276,789) in view of *Besaw et al.* (“*Besaw ‘897*”; U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0158897); and Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Besaw ‘789* in view of *Besaw ‘897* and further in view of *Nielsen* (“*Nielsen*”; U.S. Patent No. 5,937,417).

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

(I) Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-25 and 31-34

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11-25 and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Besaw ‘789* in view of *Besaw ‘897*. This rejection is traversed.

(a) Claim 1

There are several features of Claim 1 that are not taught, suggested or motivated by either *Besaw ‘789* or *Besaw ‘897* (“the *Besaw* references”). Therefore, a combination of the *Besaw* references would not make Claim 1 obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

First, the sequence in which steps are recited in Claim 1 is important and should not be disregarded. Claim 1 recites that first topology information is retrieved from a data source, converted, and a graph of a first portion of the topology is displayed based on the converted first topology information. Then, **after causing display of the graph of the first portion of the topology, second topology information is retrieved from the data source** and a graph of (a) at least a portion of the first portion and (c) a second portion of the topology based on the second topology information, is displayed, **without again retrieving the first topology information.**

The Besaw references cannot be combined to make obvious the method steps recited in Claim 1, **in the order in which the steps are performed in Claim 1.** *Besaw* '789 describes retrieving all of the topology information before proceeding with construction and plotting of a graph that represents the corresponding topology. *Besaw* '789 does not teach the **incremental plotting** technique recited in Claim 1, in which **only the portions of the topology information necessary for plotting requested portions of the topology are retrieved in response to a request.** Hence, the entire topology information is not retrieved in response to the first request for a graph. **When a subsequent request is made for plotting a different portion of the topology than was previously displayed, then, and only then, is the portion of the topology information necessary for plotting the newly requested portion of the topology retrieved from the source.**

That foregoing distinction between the disclosure of *Besaw* '789 and the embodiment recited in Claim 1 is an important distinction that facilitates the ability to efficiently and incrementally plot and display a graph. With the embodiment recited in

Claim 1, information that is not necessary for plotting and displaying a portion of the graph that is requested, is not retrieved and processed. Topology information is only retrieved and processed when needed to plot and display a portion of the graph that is requested, thus providing incremental plotting of graphs. The disclosure of *Besaw* '897 does not cure this deficiency in the disclosure of *Besaw* '789.

Next, the second topology information is automatically retrieved from a data source in response to an interaction with a graphical image from the graph of the first portion of the topology, as recited in Claim 1. A similar limitation was formerly recited in Claims 31-34, now cancelled. However, the reference citation that was relied on for the rejection of Claims 31-34 (*Besaw* '789, col. 7, lines 1-10) does not disclose, suggest or motivate this feature. In contrast, *Besaw* '789 describes that if a new object has been received and if autolayout has not been requested, then the object is placed into a holding area on the screen, where a user can subsequently use a graphic input device to move the object from the holding area to the graph. This feature described in *Besaw* '789, which provides the ability for a user to manually move an object from one area of the display screen to the graph, is clearly different than **retrieving information from a data source in response to an interaction with a graph**. *Besaw* '789 does not describe retrieving new information in response to the user moving the object. Rather *Besaw* '789 merely describes allowing manual layout of an object to the graph.

Based at least on the foregoing distinctions between the disclosure of the *Besaw* references and Claim 1, the *Besaw* references do not substantiate an obviousness rejection of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is patentable over the references of record and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

(b) Independent Claims 9, 20, 22, 24 and 25

Independent Claims 9, 20, 22, 24 and 25 recite features that are similar to the features discussed above in reference to Claim 1, regarding (1) retrieval of the second topology information after displaying the first portion of the topology, and (2) retrieving the second topology information in response to an interaction with the first portion of the topology. Therefore, the *Besaw* references also do not substantiate an obviousness rejection of Claims 9, 20, 22, 24 and 25. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 9, 20, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

(c) Dependent Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-19, 21 and 23

Each of dependent Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-19, 21 and 23 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of Claims 1, 9, 20 and 22. Therefore, these dependent claims are patentable over the *Besaw* references for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which these claims depend. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 11-19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

(d) Claims 31-34

Claims 31-34 are canceled herein. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

(II) Dependent Claims 6 and 10

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Besaw* '789 in view of *Besaw* '897 and further in view of *Nielsen*. This rejection is traversed.

Each of dependent Claims 6 and 10 depends, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1 and 9, respectively. It is shown above that the *Besaw* references fail to teach, suggest or

motivate several of the features recited in Claims 1 and 9. Therefore, the *Besaw* references, in combination with the *Nielsen* reference, do not substantiate an obviousness rejection of Claims 6 and 10 because the *Nielsen* reference does not cure the deficiencies in the *Besaw* references. Therefore, these dependent claims are patentable over the *Besaw* and *Nielsen* references for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which these claims depend. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons indicated above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims (1, 4-25 and 35) present patentable subject matter over the references of record, and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has questions regarding this case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R.
§1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortages in fees due in connection with the
filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overages to Deposit
Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully Submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG &
BECKER LLP

Date: 9/22/04

John D. Henkhaus
John D. Henkhaus
Reg. No. 42,656

(408) 414-1080, Ext. 203
Fax: (408) 414-1076
1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125-5106

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal
Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment,
Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on September 22, 2004

by

Darci Sakamoto
Darci Sakamoto

Ser. No. 09/905,306—Goldschmidt
GAU 2672 (M. Good-Johnson)
Attorney Docket No. 50325-0552